



www.courtinfo.ca.gov

COURT NEWS

A Time to Build

Facilities Bill Reenvision Court Infrastructure

BLAINE CORREN

New law shifts the governance of California's more than 450 courthouse facilities from the counties to the state

On September 30, Governor Gray Davis signed the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Senate Bill 1732) into law. The bill sets forth the blueprint for how the state will assume responsibility for all court buildings statewide. Cosponsored by the Judicial Council and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the bill was authored by Senator Martha Escutia (D-Whitter) and completes the transformation of 58 separate local courts into a system fully operated by the state.

"I applaud the Governor for his leadership and vision in signing this important legislation," said Chief Justice Ronald M. George in a press release disseminated by the Judicial Council after the signing. "Today, the California trial courts can cele-

brate one of the most significant court reforms in history, as the state prepares to assume oversight and financial responsibility for California courthouses."

STATEWIDE SYSTEM

The legislation is the latest step in the restructuring of California's court system, which has undergone a major transformation since 1998 with the implementation of state trial court funding and trial court unification.

The act directs the Judicial Council and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) to exercise full responsibility, jurisdiction, and control for court facilities, including planning and construction, acquisition, disposition, operation, and maintenance of those buildings. "California's judiciary, through our Judicial Council, will assume the direct responsibility for this important aspect of the administration of justice—an ownership and management responsibility that I believe is unique among our 50 states," said Chief Justice George in a recent speech at the National Center for State Courts. "Decisions about our judicial branch now can be made taking into account all of its needs. We have truly transformed a hodgepodge collection of county-based courts into a statewide system of justice."

NEED FOR STATE OWNERSHIP

Under the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997

(Assembly Bill 233, Escutia and Pringle), funding of trial court operations became a state responsibility. The act also created the Task Force on Court Facilities, made up of judges, court staff, attorneys, and representatives from city and county governments and the real estate industry. The mandate of the task force was to review and report on the status of court facilities throughout the state and to make recommendations as to which government entity should be responsible for funding and managing court facility construction and maintenance.

With help from consultants, the task force took an inventory of the state's court facilities. Consultants visited every courthouse in the state, evaluating the physical condition and functionality of the buildings. Each facility was rated as adequate, marginal, or deficient. Commenting on the current status of court facilities in his State of the Judiciary Address in March 2001, Chief Justice George warned the Legislature that it would find the results of the task force's report "alarming in many instances" and that "many locations simply are unfit for the purpose for which they are being used."

The task force submitted its final report to the Judicial Council, Governor, and Legislature in October 2001 with the recommendation that the state assume full responsibility for all of the state's court facilities over a



Chief Justice Ronald M. George looks on as Governor Gray Davis signs Senate Bill 1732, shifting the governance of California's more than 450 courthouse facilities from the counties to the state. The act, effective January 1, 2003, will instantly double the usable building space owned by the state from 10 million to 20 million square feet. Photo: Brian Baer

three-year period. The report supported the Chief Justice's concerns, finding that 22 percent of all usable area for court operations was located in buildings rated functionally deficient and that 21 percent of all courtrooms were rated deficient for their current use.

In addition, the task force identified common problems related to security, jury assembly rooms, meeting space for conferences and settlement negotiations, and access for persons with disabilities. It also noted that a significant number of court

Continued on page 6

IN THIS ISSUE

A TIME TO BUILD	1
JAIC 2002	1
MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE	2
COUNCIL APPROVES CAPITAL COUNSEL STANDARDS	3
COUNCIL BRIEFS BAR.....	3
IN THE NEWS	4
ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANTS	4
CALAVERAS PARENTING CLASSES.....	5
NEW FINANCE EXPERTS	5
COUNTY PROFILE	5
SUPREME COURT BROADCAST.....	6
CHILD ADVOCACY PROJECT.....	7
Q&A WITH COMMISSIONER PATRICIA H. WONG	8
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT	9
NEW JUDICIAL FELLOWS	9
EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT	10
RESOURCES.....	10
COURT BRIEFS	11
MILESTONES.....	12
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS.....	12
THANK YOU TO VOLUNTEERS	13
GETTING IN TOUCH	15
CALENDAR.....	16

JAIC 2002: Managing the Courts

MARK POTHIER

More than 300 court managers and supervisors came together at the Judicial Administration Institute of California (JAIC) conference to meet one

another, share experiences, and enhance their day-to-day knowledge and skills for operating their courts. This first annual conference took place at the Sheraton Grand Hotel in Sacramento, September 9-13.



Michael A. Tozzi, Executive Officer of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County, helps participants work through caseflow management challenges. Photo: Mark Pothier

"One of the most effective ways to create real, far-reaching change in court administration is by working directly with managers and supervisors—people who are closer to the daily business of the court," said Kent Yeargin, Deputy Executive Officer/IT Manager of the Superior Court of Yolo County.

JAIC also served as a branch-wide communication bridge between executive leadership (the Judicial Council and its advisory committees, presiding judges, and executive officers) and local court managers and administrators by focusing on the operational aspects of some of the concepts discussed at the annual California Judicial Administration Conference (CJAC) held earlier this year.

Continued on page 7

Thank You

Every year, hundreds of individuals volunteer to serve on the Judicial Council's advisory committees and task forces. Their efforts assist the council in setting direction for judicial administration in California. On pages 13-15, *Court News* recognizes these individuals who are so vital to improving the justice system.



Chief Justice
Ronald M.
George

MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE

State of the Judiciary Address

On October 12, Chief Justice Ronald M. George delivered the State of the Judiciary Address at the State Bar annual meeting in Monterey. He discussed recent reforms in the courts and initiatives to improve the administration of justice. Following is an excerpt from the address.

As I appear before you this morning, I remember the exhilaration I felt in 1997, when I was able to announce to the Conference of Delegates that only a few hours earlier, the state Trial Court Funding Act had been enacted, late at night during the last day of the legislative session. Five years later, I am equally pleased to announce the enactment of the Court Facilities Bill two weeks ago. This third landmark structural reform completes the process of transforming the trial courts from what were county components of our judicial branch into what is now an integrated, truly statewide judicial system.

COURTHOUSE FACILITIES

The status of courthouse facilities had been the one final piece of the puzzle that was not yet in place. When state funding was adopted, the courthouses in which the trial courts performed their functions were expressly exempted from the state's control, and the question whether to relieve the counties of this obligation was left deliberately for a later day.

This action created a troubling and anomalous situation. The trial courts had become the state's responsibility, but the ownership and management of the buildings in which these courts continued to operate remained with the counties, which were no longer involved in the operations of the courts and thus had a diminishing interest in their welfare.

In October 2001, the Task Force on Court Facilities, created by the Legislature and including diverse representatives from all three branches of government, issued its report after three years of study. The report disclosed that 54 percent of court space is located in buildings that are rated either "functionally deficient" or "marginal"—some of them posing severe seismic or health problems to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, and the court staffs who work in them. Significant repair, maintenance, or renovation is required in more than 90 percent of the facilities—many of which suffer from inadequate security, dilapidated and deficient quarters, and facilities incapable of accommodating modern demands. In short, the survey of existing court space revealed an urgent need for remediation.

Senate Bill 1732, authored by Senator Martha Escutia, chair of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, was signed into law two weeks ago by Governor Gray Davis. This historic measure establishes a process to transfer ownership and management responsibility for trial court facilities to the state, under the direct oversight of the Judicial Council, over a period covering the years 2004 to 2007.

The act sets forth specific procedures and conditions for the transitional period and beyond. It raises penalty assessments and parking offense penalties and creates a civil filing fee surcharge, all of which are to be deposited into a newly created state Courthouse Construction Fund to be used for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and construction of court facilities.

Other amendments to the various penalties and fees were imposed to augment the General Fund, but the portion amended in accordance with the proposals of the Task Force on Court Facilities is earmarked solely for facilities. I appreciate the support of so many bar organizations and bar leaders in obtaining these dedicated revenues.

The historic shift in obligations brought about by this enactment conforms to the state's assumption of responsibility to fund the courts. It recognizes that every fundamental aspect of the administration of justice in our system properly must be viewed as a statewide function.

The transfer of responsibility will permit our court system to integrate planning for court operations and court facilities and to evaluate needs and solutions on a statewide level. It will further enhance the judicial branch's role and its accountability to the public and to its sister branches of government. . . .

HIGH COURT BROADCAST

Earlier this week, the Supreme Court for the first time held an oral argument session in Fresno that began with

the justices answering questions directly addressed to the court by students present in the courtroom.

The session was televised on the Central Valley and Sacramento public broadcasting stations as well as more than 125 cable stations, and will be carried on a later broadcast to the Los Angeles Unified School District by the California Channel. In almost 200 high schools, students watched the proceedings after having been furnished with a set of comprehensive written materials that explained the court processes and gave background information on the individual cases being argued. Volunteer lawyers and judges were on hand in the classrooms to lead discussions and make this a valuable learning experience. This was probably the largest court public educational program ever conducted anywhere. . . .

UNIFORM RULES

A comprehensive overhaul of the rules of court that govern our system is under way. The Appellate Rules Project is revising the entire set of appellate rules for the first time since they were originally adopted six decades ago. The revised rules that govern the filing of a civil appeal and preparation of the appellate record and briefs took effect on January 1 of this year, and the next installment—which addresses hearings and decisions in the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court—will be considered for adoption at the Judicial Council's November 1 meeting. Rules for criminal and juvenile appeals are next on the agenda.

The rules of court governing civil case management were revised effective July 1, 2002, providing an integrated, up-to-date set of rules designed to promote best practices and simplify court procedures. A mandatory case management statement was adopted to provide consistency in required forms.

The council already has adopted several sets of uniform rules, and the next phase will be the adoption of additional uniform rules of practice and procedure in probate matters. . . .

ADR ETHICS STANDARDS

In response to a legislative directive, the Judicial Council also adopted the first set of ethics standards for arbitrators in contractual arbitrations. These comprehensive standards are designed to address concerns about the fairness of private dispute resolution processes and were developed with the participation of a 19-member panel of experts on arbitrator ethics drawn from every facet of the interested legal and arbitration communities.

The standards establish the paramount duty of arbitrators to act in a manner that upholds the integrity and fairness of the arbitration process. To further this goal, the standards impose expanded disclosure requirements to ensure that the parties are aware of the backgrounds and relationships of the arbitrators and restrict the ability of arbitrators to accept subsequent employment, gifts, or honoraria from individuals involved in proceedings before them. The standards are being reviewed after having been recirculated for public comment.

DEATH PENALTY PROCEDURES

Like the Judicial Council, the Supreme Court has been reviewing procedures governing areas of its specific responsibility. Among the procedures being reviewed are those affecting the handling of death penalty appeals and related habeas corpus matters.

Our court's staff continues to meet regularly with the executive directors of the Habeas Corpus Resource Center and the California Appellate Project, and the State Public Defender. At the court's request, these three individuals have held focus group sessions to obtain suggestions from members of the bar on steps the court could take to alleviate the shortage of counsel qualified to represent defendants convicted of capital offenses.

One of the obligations incumbent on lawyers in our state is to ensure that defendants under sentence of death do not remain on death row without counsel. I hope that you will give careful consideration to what you can do, as members of the bar, to ameliorate this situation. . . .

There are new developments in every segment of the judicial branch and of the legal profession. Having given you examples of some of these accomplishments, I hope they provide you with a sense of the initiative and energy being devoted to improving our legal and judicial systems in California.

Take
Note

For the full
text of the
Chief Justice's
State of the

Judiciary Address, visit the
California Courts Web site
at [www.courtinfo.ca.gov](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/soj1002.htm)
/reference/soj1002.htm.

Judicial Council Action

Council Approves Standards For Capital Counsel

At its November 1 meeting, the Judicial Council approved the first minimum standards for attorneys appointed to represent death penalty defendants in state trial courts. The new standards, which were widely circulated for comment before presentation to the council, take effect January 1, 2003.

Although many trial courts already have local rules or policies governing court-appointed counsel, the new statewide rules are the first of their kind in California. They are part of the council's efforts to adopt uniform statewide rules of court practice and procedure. Such rules have already been adopted in other areas, including civil law and motion practice, probate proceedings, and case management.

"With today's action, the Judicial Council recognizes the importance of having statewide rules to guide the trial courts in this critically important function," said Chief Justice Ronald M. George, chair of the council. "The minimum standards parallel the efforts of the Supreme Court in providing guidelines for the appointment of counsel in capital appeals and habeas corpus proceedings."

Rule 4.117 of the California Rules of Court, which contains the new minimum standards, provides for the following:

□ A trial court must ap-

point counsel only if the court, after reviewing the attorney's background, experience, and training, determines that the attorney has demonstrated the skill, knowledge, and proficiency to diligently and competently represent the defendant.

□ To be eligible to serve as lead defense counsel in a capital case, an attorney must meet detailed qualifications, including having at least 10 years' litigation experience in the field of criminal law; prior experience as lead counsel in specified types of

trials; and at least 15 hours of capital case defense training, approved as State Bar Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) credit, prior to appointment. The rule provides similar qualifications for associate counsel.

□ A court may appoint an attorney even if he or she does not meet all of the qualifications, provided the trial court finds on the record that the attorney meets specified alternative qualifications that demonstrate the ability to provide competent

representation of the defendant. This provision allows the trial courts to have some flexibility in making appointments.

□ When appointed by the trial court, the public defender should assign an attorney from his or her office who meets the qualifications required of private counsel appointed to capital cases.

OTHER ACTIONS

In other actions, the council approved:

□ The second installment of major revisions to the rules governing court practice and procedure in the state appellate courts and amended rules on the transfer of cases from the appellate divisions of superior courts to the Courts of Appeal. The changes are designed to clarify the meaning of the rules and to facilitate their use by courts and practitioners.

□ Statewide rules standardizing electronic filing and service of documents in state trial courts. Electronic filing is not mandatory at this time, and the rules recognize that not all courts currently have the resources to move to a paperless environment.

□ A recommendation from the Task Force on Judicial Service for a three-year pilot program that allows jurists, subject to a council-appointed committee, to take four-month, paid, educational sabbaticals. The rule limits sabbaticals to four state judges per year. The council also adopted a rule of court establishing a Judicial Services Advisory Committee.

□ A new rule establishing minimum qualification and training standards for subordinate judicial officers (SJOs) that requires them to have a minimum of 10 years of State Bar membership or, upon a finding of good cause by the presiding judge, 5 years of State Bar membership. The rule also requires that SJOs comply with the judicial education requirements applicable to any assignment in which they serve, even if the assignment is for a short time.

□ Plain-language forms for domestic violence restraining orders and adoptions, designed to be easier for self-represented litigants to complete and understand than current forms.

□ New and amended rules to comply with legislation and the council's request to define the role, responsibilities, and limitations of guardians ad litem under the Child Abuse and Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) for children in proceedings involving abuse or neglect.

□ New and amended rules and forms to modernize the management and administration of the courts through uniform rules of practice and procedure in civil and small claims, criminal, family and juvenile, probate and mental health, court technology, and traffic matters. (A report on the new rules and copies of the new forms have been distributed to the courts.) ■

Adoption Month



At the Judicial Council business meeting on November 1, Chief Deputy Administrative Director of the Courts Ronald G. Overholt (left) looks on as Chief Justice Ronald M. George signs a declaration proclaiming November as Court Adoption and Permanency Month in California.

Judicial Council Briefs Bar On Court Reforms

In a first-of-its-kind briefing, attorneys attending the State Bar's annual meeting in October had the opportunity to learn more about recent court reforms affecting the judicial system.

The workshop, "California Courts Briefing: What Attorneys

Need to Know," provided an update on a variety of topics, including recent legislation affecting trial court funding, progress in e-filing and electronic access to court records, the status of California trial court facilities, and improve-

ments in the jury system.

Administrative Director of the Courts William C. Vickrey served as moderator for the panel, which included current and former Judicial Council members Justice Ronald B. Robie of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District; Assistant Presiding Judge Robert A. Dukes of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County; and Deputy Attorney General Pauline W. Gee.

The panelists also took the opportunity to explain the roles of the council and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). The workshop provided an overview of the makeup and responsibilities of both organizations and explained how they operate. Panelists encouraged bar members to participate in improving the administration of justice by commenting on proposals for new court rules, serving on Judicial Council advisory committees and task forces, and working with the courts through their local bar associations on court-community initiatives. ■



Justice Ronald B. Robie (far left) and Deputy Attorney General Pauline W. Gee listen as Judge Robert A. Dukes (far right) addresses attendees at the State Bar's annual conference. Along with Administrative Director of the Courts William C. Vickrey, they served as the panel for a first-of-its-kind briefing by the Judicial Council to inform attorneys about recent court reforms affecting the judicial system. Photo: Sherri Eng

In the News

Teachers in Court

Teachers in Los Angeles County are becoming better prepared to teach their students about the justice system, thanks to seminars and CD-ROMs being offered by the superior court.

Articles in the October 16 edition of the *Los Angeles Times* and the October 10 issue of the *Metropolitan News-Enterprise* featured the Superior Court of Los Angeles County's Teachers' Courthouse Seminars program. The stories mentioned how the daylong seminars conducted at the courthouse provided firsthand information for government high-school teachers to take back to their classes.

Teachers who attend the seminar also receive a new CD-ROM developed by the court and the Los Angeles County Office of Education, under a grant from the Judicial Council. The CD-ROM helps teachers educate their students about the legal system by providing a step-by-step description of a criminal case from filing to disposition. In addition, it includes three simulated hearings in which judges decide issues that are often raised in criminal cases.

The CD-ROM provides lesson plans for the three scenarios and the appellate opinions on which they are based. "Our hope is that teachers will use the CD-ROM in their teaching about trial courts in their government classes," said Superior Court of Los Angeles County Judge Richard L. Fruin in a press release distributed by the court. Judge Fruin chairs its Court/Community Outreach Commit-

tee. "We will be asking the teachers to provide feedback so that we can improve and expand the CD-ROM in a future version."

One teacher, after attending the seminar, responded that, "As an attorney teaching high school, I was impressed by everything about this program. This was by far the most useful seminar that the Los Angeles Unified School District has offered. Thank you."

The stories on the seminars were a result of the press release the court sent to local media. Because of such publicity, more teachers can take advantage of the seminars and the public is more aware of the court's efforts to educate the community.

Other stories in the news:

"Law and Order 101," *Press-Enterprise* (Riverside), October 20, 2002

Described the Superior Court of Riverside County's Teach the Teachers program, which allows teachers to see the justice system firsthand by interacting with attorneys, judges, and court staff.

"One-of-a-Kind Center Will Offer Free Legal Services in Spanish," *Vida*, October 16, 2002; **"Spanish Speakers Get Help With Civil Cases,"** *Fresno Bee*, October 11, 2002

Announced the Fresno court's new Spanish Self-Help Education and Information Center, which offers informational materials in Spanish and volunteer interpreters for those who represent themselves in court. (See



Teachers in Los Angeles County are becoming better prepared to teach their students about the justice system, thanks to seminars being offered by the superior court. Photo: Courtesy of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Court News story this issue on page 11.)

"Alameda County Court Plays Up Customer Care," *Tri Valley Herald* (Pleasanton), October 10, 2002

Described the Superior Court of Alameda County's second annual Customer Service Week, during which time the court focuses on services it provides to the community.

"Court Close-Up," *Fresno Bee*, October 9, 2002

Described the California Supreme Court's special session in Fresno, which was broadcast on Valley Public Television and 125 cable stations on the California Channel. (See *Court News* story this issue on page 6.)

"Youth Guide Out," *Inyo Register* (Bishop), October 5, 2002

Announced the availability of the Superior Court of Inyo County's new publication, *Youth*

Resource Guide 2002, which assists youth and their parents in learning more about organizations that provide activities for children.

"3rd District Justices Visit Stockton," *Record* (Stockton), September 26, 2002

Reported on the special session of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, at Stagg High School, which gave students a firsthand look at the court.

"More Branches of Superior Court Now Handling Traffic Citations on Phone, Internet," *Metropolitan News Enterprise* (Los Angeles), September 26, 2002; **"Taking Sting Out of Paying Tickets,"** *Pasadena Star News*, August 18, 2002

Detailed how the Superior Court of Los Angeles County is expanding the options for paying traffic tickets, including using the phone or the Internet. ■

Courts Receive Access to Visitation Grants

In August, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of \$800,000 statewide to improve the quality of parent-child relationships by expanding the scope and availability of support services for families with children who have been or are now in family courts.

Sixteen superior courts representing 34 counties received fiscal year 2002–2003 funding as part of the Access to Visitation Grant Program. The grant program is administered by the Administrative Office of the Courts' Center for Families, Children & the Courts.

The goals of the program are to increase nonresidential parents' access to their children and to ensure the health, safety, welfare, and best interest of those children. The grants help courts provide education for parents on protecting children during fam-

ily disruption, group counseling for parents and children, supervised visitation, and neutral drop-off and exchange services.

In 1996 Congress passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, which required the federal government to make funds available to states for the establishment of programs that support and facilitate noncustodial parents' visitation and access to

their children (section 469B of the Social Security Act). The funds are distributed through federal grants awarded by the Office of Child Support Enforcement of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families. Since their inception, the grants have funded a variety of state programs, including those involving mediation (both voluntary and mandatory), par-

ent and child counseling and education, and assistance in the development of parenting plans and guidelines for visitation.

● For more information about the Access to Visitation Grant Program, contact Shelly Danridge, Access to Visitation Grant Coordinator, 415-865-7565; e-mail: shelly.danridge@jud.ca.gov. ■

The following superior courts have been awarded funding for fiscal year 2002–2003 under the Access to Visitation Grant Program.

Amador County—\$48,000
Butte County—\$50,000
Los Angeles County—\$80,000
Madera County—\$30,000
Mendocino County—\$80,000
Merced County—\$30,000
Napa County—\$25,000
Sacramento County—\$64,000

San Diego County—\$18,436
San Francisco County—\$50,000
Santa Clara County—\$80,000
Santa Cruz County—\$64,000
Shasta County—\$80,000
Sonoma County—\$34,500
Tulare County—\$36,064
Yuba County—\$30,000

Calaveras Offers Parenting Classes

Thanks to the Superior Court of Calaveras County, divorced or divorcing parents have a new opportunity to learn how to shield their children from parental conflicts and establish a positive, long-term relationship as co-parents.

The court is coordinating the Cooperative Parenting and Divorce program, an eight-week course that combines videos, activities, and group discussions to help parents refocus their attention on their children, rather than on each other. The program was created by family therapists Susan Boyan and Ann Marie Termini, who had observed the harmful effects of divorce on their child clients. Rather than attempt to “fix” the children, they decided to design a course that targeted the root of the problem: quarreling parents.

HOW IT WORKS

The program is not mandatory for parents who come before the court; they are referred to it by child custody mediators. In addition, the court has information about the program at its public information booth.

The course is taught by licensed child custody evaluators and mediators. Parents attend

eight weekly classes and receive a certificate upon completion. In some cases, divorced parents are encouraged to take the course at the same time. The court provides child care on site.

“The classes have been very positively received,” says Diane Goodman, Family Court Services Director, who helps to oversee the program. “Parents seem to appreciate the fact that the court is offering this service.”

The program is funded by the county’s Proposition 10—Calaveras First Five fund, which provided money resulting from recent tobacco company settlements. The court applied for and received a grant from the portion of the money dedicated to parent education programs.

The first class in the initial eight-week course was given on September 4 at the San Andreas Senior Center. The courses will be given at locations throughout the county. The program is scheduled to continue through June 30, but the court is hoping that it will gain additional funding that will enable it to extend into the next fiscal year.

● For more information, contact Diane Goodman, Superior Court of Calaveras County, 209-754-6832. ■

CountyProfile

Modoc



The main courthouse, located in Alturas, was dedicated in 1914.

Geographic area: 3,944 square miles, located in the northeastern corner of California

Population: According to the 2000 U.S. census, the population is approximately 9,333 and has decreased 2.4 percent since 1990.

Demographics: Age: 0–19 ≈ 26%; 20–39 ≈ 25%; 40–59 ≈ 27%; 60–79 ≈ 17%; 80+ ≈ 5%

Race/ethnicity: White ≈ 75%; Hispanic/Latino ≈ 11%; American Indian/Alaska Native ≈ 4%; Asian ≈ 1%; black/African American ≈ 1%; some other race/ethnicity ≈ 5%; two or more races/ethnicities ≈ 3%

Number of court locations: 1

Number of authorized judges: 2

Number of court staff: 11

Caseload: Filings for fiscal year 2000–2001 totaled 1,999

Presiding judge: Larry L. Dier

Executive officer: Vicki L. Hughes



Sources: Superior Court of Modoc County; California Department of Finance; U.S. Census Bureau

AOC’s Finance Division Redefines Itself

The Administrative Office of the Courts’ Finance Division has reconfigured many of its functional areas to better serve its customers. Following is a breakdown of those areas.

OFFICE OF ACCOUNTING, AUDIT, AND BUSINESS SERVICES
PAT HAGGERTY, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

Accounting Service
Accounts Payable Unit
General Ledger Unit
Grant Accounting Unit
Business Services
Internal Audit
Trial Court Accounting Processing Center
Trial Court Fiscal Services

OFFICE OF BUDGET MANAGEMENT
STEPHEN NASH, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

Budget, Data, and Technical Support Unit
Budget Development Unit
Trial Court Budget Program and Policy Unit
Trial Court Regional Budget Support Unit

OFFICE OF CAPITAL PLANNING, DESIGN, AND CONSTRUCTION
KIM DAVIS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

● To view contacts for each service or unit within the division, go to <http://serranus.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/finance/>. For more information, contact the AOC’s Finance Division, 415-865-7960.

AOC Welcomes New Finance Professionals

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) recently welcomed two finance professionals who promise to improve budgetary and accounting services to the courts.

NEW BUDGET EXPERT

Stephen Nash succeeds Sandi Derr as the AOC’s assistant director of finance and head of the Office of Budget Management. His office will be responsible for providing assistance to the trial courts with items such as:

- Budget change requests;
- Baseline budget preparation;
- Completion of various financial reports such as Schedules 1 and 7A; and
- Distribution of monthly trial court allocations.

Mr. Nash will also oversee budgetary services provided to the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Habeas Corpus Resource Center, and the AOC, in-

cluding budget tracking and projections and fiscal analysis of legislation. The Office of Budget Management also responds to budget inquiries from the Legislature, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office.

Mr. Nash brings with him a wealth of experience of state fiscal policies and procedures. In his last assignment, he served as the deputy director of administrative services for the California Youth Authority. In this capacity, he managed the Financial Management, Personnel, Facilities Planning, Training, and Research Divisions. He also worked at the Department of Finance for six years, during which time he was responsible for various state fiscal program areas. Prior to that, Mr. Nash worked for two years as a tax auditor with the Employment Development Department.

NEW APC MANAGER

Fred Salimi joined the AOC in August 2002 as the manager of the AOC’s new trial court accounting processing center (APC), located in the AOC’s Northern/Central Regional Office in Sacramento. Mr. Salimi has overall responsibility for the center’s daily operations, which include reviewing and processing invoices and maintaining financial information, as well as offering contract management services. The center also aims to centralize the compilation of mandated financial reports, such as quarterly financial statements and consolidated annual financial reports.

Prior to joining the AOC, Mr. Salimi was the financial accounting manager for Palm Inc.’s Worldwide Sales, Services, and International Marketing Group. His previous experience includes many years of working in the finance industry as a controller and financial systems consultant. ■